UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/350,144	07/09/1999	KAZUNORI TAKAHASHI	21.1935	7639

21171 7590 10/22/2003

STAAS & HALSEY LLP
SUITE 700
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER	
CHEVALIER, ROBERT	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2615	11

DATE MAILED: 10/22/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/350,144	TAKAHASHI, KAZUNORI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Bob Chevalier	2615	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *24 September 2003* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,10-18 and 22-27* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-6,10-18 and 22-27* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *09 July 1999* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 6, 10, 12-16, 18, 22, 24-27, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto et al in view of Adachi.

Okamoto et al discloses a video recording/reproducing apparatus that shows the same limitations recited in claims 1, 13, and 25, including the feature of detecting a copy guard signal, indicating a copying restriction, included in an input video signal (See Okamoto et al's Figure 1, component 7; it is to be noted that the detected copy guard information disclosed in Okamoto et al also indicates copying restriction, such as permission of copying only once, or inhibition of copying; see Okamoto et al's column 4, lines 3-14), the feature of digitizing the input video signal (See Okamoto et al's Figure 1, component 6), the feature of processing circuit screen information digitized by the video decoding circuit (See Okamoto et al's Figure 1, components 2-4, and column 3, lines 5-6, where it is disclosed the capability of compressing the inputted video signal), and the feature of storing the screen information to a storage device in a case where the copy guard detecting circuit detects a copy guard signal as specified in the present claims 1, 13, and 25. (See Okamoto et al's Figure 1, component 14, and 1, and column 3, lines 9-22, and column 4, lines 3-14, where it is disclosed the capability of storing the

information in the case where the copy information indicates permissibility of copy, or permissibility of copying only once).

Although Okamoto et al discloses the feature of compressing the screen information of the image before recording the same, Okamoto et al fails to specifically disclose the feature of reducing said information to deteriorate the image quality as claimed. (See Okamato et al's column 3, lines 5-6).

Adachi discloses an apparatus for compressing and extending image signals. The cited reference of Adachi indicates that compressing an image signal would necessarily deteriorate the image quality as claimed. (See Adachi's column 1, lines 34-50).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the Okamoto et al's apparatus wherein the processing means provided thereof (See Okamoto et al's Figure 1, component 3) would incorporate the capability of compressing the inputted image information wherein the image quality would necessarily be deteriorated in the same conventional manner as described in column 1, lines 34-50 of Adachi. The motivation of such a modification being to improve the recording density of the recording medium as suggested by Adachi.

With regard to claims 2, 14, and 26, the feature of the image processing circuit preventing from storing screen information digitized by the video decoding circuit to a storage device in the case where the copy guard detecting circuit detects the copy guard signal as specified thereof is present in the proposed combination of Okamoto et al and Adachi indicated above. (See Okamoto et al's Figure 1, components 2-4, which

disclose the image processing circuit, and further, see Okamoto et al's column 3, lines 22-25, where it is disclosed prevention of recording operation when the copy guard signal indicates inhibition of copy).

With regard to claims 3, 15, and 27, the feature of storing to a storage device both screen information digitized and the fact of the detection of the copy guard signal as specified thereof is present in the proposed combination of Okamoto et al and Adachi indicated above. (See Okamoto et al's Figure 1, components 2-4, for the image processing circuit, and further, see Okamoto et al's column 3, lines 38-43, where it is disclosed the capability of recording reduced video signal together with copy information).

With regard to claims 6, 12, 18, and 24, the feature of adding copy guard signal to the output of screen information stored at the storage device, encoding and outputting a video signal as specified thereof is present in the proposed combination of Okamoto et al and Adachi indicated above. (See Okamoto et al's Figure 1, components 3-5, and further, see Okamoto et al's column 3, lines 60-67, where it is disclosed that copy information is added to the reproduced video signal).

With regard to claims 10, and 22, the feature of the image processing circuit reducing the digitized screen information in the case the digitized screen information is protected from copying and outputting the reduced and digitized information as specified thereof is present in the proposed combination of Okamoto et al and Adachi indicated above. (See Okamoto et al's Figure 1, component 2, 3, 4, and 6, and further see, Okamoto et al's column 2, lines 50-52, and column 3, lines 9-22, where it is

disclosed the capability of compressing/reducing the digitized video signal and outputting the reduced video signal to the storage medium for recording purposes in the case where the copy information detected indicates permissible of recording operation).

With regard to claim 16, the feature of reducing the screen information stored at the storage device and outputting a video signal of the reduced screen information as specified thereof is present in the proposed combination of Okamoto et al and Adachi indicated above. (See Okamoto et al's Figure 1, components 11, and 13).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 4-5, 11, 17, and 23, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Okamoto et al and Adachi as applied to claims 1-3, 6, 10, 12-16, 18, 22, 24-27 above, and further in view of the submitted prior art of Kitazawa Hiroaki (P.N. 09083920).

The proposed combination of Okamoto et al and Adachi indicated above discloses a video recording/reproducing apparatus that shows substantially the same limitations recited in claims 4-5, 11, 17, and 23, including the feature of storing to a storage device both screen information signal and copy guard signal and reproducing the stored signals from said storage device as specified in the present claims 4-5, 11,

17, and 23. (See Okamoto et al's column 3, lines 38-43, and Okamoto et al's Figure 1, components).

The proposed combination of Okamoto et al and Adachi indicated above fails to specifically disclose the feature of preventing the video encoding circuit from outputting the video signal in the case where an output of screen information stored in the storage device is ordered, and in the case where the information is protected from copying as specified in the present claims 4-5, 11, 17, and 23.

The submitted prior art Kitazawa Hiroaki does disclose a reproducing apparatus which includes the capability of preventing a video encoding circuit from outputting an inputted video signal received from a storage device based on copy guard signal as specified in the present claims 4-5, 11, 17, and 23. (See Kitazawa's Figure 1 and the corresponding disclosure).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify the proposed combination of Okamoto et al and Adachi's recording/reproducing apparatus wherein the reproducing means/encoding means provided thereof (See Okamoto et al's Figure 1, components 2-4) would incorporate the capability of preventing the processing means from outputting the video signal in the case where an output of screen information stored in the storage device is ordered in the same conventional manner as shown by Kitazawa Hiroaki. The motivation being to prevent unauthorized viewing of the reproduced video signal as suggested by Kitazawa Hiroaki.

Response to Arguments

With regard to Applicant's arguments in that Okamoto et al fails to disclose the feature of reducing to deteriorate image quality, Applicant's attention is directed to new ground of rejection of claims 1-3, 6, 10, 12-16, 18, 22, 24-27, indicated above. (See the proposed combination of Okamoto et al and Adachi specified above).

With regard to Applicant's argument in that Okamoto et al fails to disclose the feature of recording screen information when a copy guard signal is detected indicating a copying restriction, Examiner disagrees. It is noted that such a feature argued by Applicant is disclosed in Okamoto et al. Since, Okamoto et al does disclose the capability of detecting copy guard signal from the input video signal and the capability of recording the video signal upon detection of said copy guard signal. (See Okamoto et al's Figure 1, component 7). It is further to be noted that such a detected copy guard signal in Okamoto et al does include copying restriction information as claimed and which copying restriction information can be regarded, for example, as in the case wherein recording of the video signal being permitted to be done only once. Applicant's attention is directed to Okamoto et al's column 4, lines 20-22.

With regard to Applicant's argument in that the Okamoto et al fails to disclose the feature of preventing storing of screen information, Examiner disagrees. Okamoto et al does disclose the feature of preventing storing of screen information in the case where the copy information indicates inhibition of copying. (See Okamoto et al's column 3, lines 22-25, and column 4, lines 22-24).

With regard to Applicant's argument in that Okamoto fails to disclose the feature of storing the reduced information and outputting the video signal of the reduced screen information, Examiner disagrees. Applicant's attention is directed to Okamoto et al's Figure 1, components 11, and 13, where it is disclosed that the video of the reduced screen information stored at the recording medium 1 can be outputted.

With regard to Applicant's argument in that the proposed combination of Okamoto et al and Kitazawa Hiroaki indicated above being improper, because, Kitazawa Hiroaki fails to disclose the feature of the image processing apparatus recording screen information, Examiner disagrees. It is to be noted that Kitazawa Hiroaki does not need to disclose such a feature of the image processing apparatus recording screen information. Since, Okamoto et al does already disclose said feature of the image processing apparatus recording screen information as claimed. (See Okamoto et al's Figure 1). Kitazawa Hiroaki is cited in a manner to modify the proposed combination of Okamoto et al and Adachi's apparatus wherein the reproducing means/encoding means provided thereof (See Okamoto et al's Figure 1, components 2-4) would incorporate the capability of preventing the processing means from outputting the video signal in the case where an output of screen information stored in the storage device is ordered in the same conventional manner as shown by Kitazawa Hiroaki. (See Kitazawa Hiroaki's Figure 1, and the corresponding disclosure). The motivation being to prevent unauthorized viewing of the reproduced video signal as suggested by Kitazawa Hiroaki.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bob Chevalier whose telephone number is 703-305-4780. The examiner can normally be reached on MM-F (9:00-6:30), second Monday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Christensen can be reached on 703-308-9644. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-306-0377.

ROBERT CHEVALIER
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Bob Chevalier
October 16, 2003

1.